UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

INTRODUCTION

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

A Program of Church Reform

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Unknown Dead

By FRANK W. GARRISON

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 12

Chicago, May 19, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE
Pamphlet Mission
FOR
FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER
IN
RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 179
A Program of Church Reform.—John Haynes Holmes 181

CONTRIBUTED—
Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. Introduction: Individual and Society.—George Willis Cooke 185
The Unknown Dead.—Frank W. Garrison 186
War and Insanity.—Lydia G. Wentworth 187

SELECTED—
A Father's Letter 189
The Boy Scouts.—*Gandhi* 190

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Day of Remembrance.—Abraham Cronbach 190
A Suggestion to Mr. Tinker's Correspondents.—The Vicar of Bray 190

POETRY—
Men Told Me, Lord.—*David Starr Jordan* 179
The Tuft of Flowers.—*Robert Frost* 184
Spiritus Æternus.—Dombey 190

THE FIELD—
A Letter from England 191
Toward Future Peace 191

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXVII THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1921 Number 12

MEN TOLD ME, LORD.

(1851-1921)

Men told me, Lord, it was a vale of tears
Where Thou hadst placed me, wickedness and woe
My twain companions whereso I might go;
That I through ten and three-score weary years
Should stumble on, beset by pains and fears,
Fierce conflict round me, passions hot within,
Enjoyment brief and fatal, but in sin.
When all was ended then should I demand
Full compensation from Thine austere hand;
For, 'tis Thy pleasure, all temptation past,
To be not just but generous at last.

Lord, here am I! My three-score years and ten
All counted to the full; I've fought Thy fight,
Crossed Thy dark valleys, scaled Thy rocks' harsh height,
Borne all Thy burdens Thou dost lay on men
With hand unsparing, three-score years and ten.
Before Thee now I make my claim, O Lord!
What shall I pray Thee as a meet reward?

I ask for nothing! Let the balance fall!
All that I am or know or may confess
But swells the weight of mine indebtedness;
Burdens and sorrows stand transfigured all;
Thy hand's rude buffet turns to a caress,
For Love, with all the rest, Thou gav'st me here,
And Love is Heaven's very atmosphere!

Lo, I have dwelt with Thee, Lord, day by day,
I could do no more, through all Eternity!

—*David Starr Jordan.*

Any man who can understand the foreign policy of the Harding administration is entitled to a leather medal and prompt promotion to the head of the class. Any man who can prophesy what this policy will be from day to day should be set apart and worshipped as a seer. On one morning, we are blithely informed that the Knox Resolution will be passed immediately, and a separate treaty of peace with Germany at once concluded. Irreconcilables joyful! The next morning it is pontifically announced that the Knox Resolution will be held up for an indefinite period in the House, and the Versailles Treaty be resubmitted to the Senate for ratification. Irreconcilables in the dumps! The fact that President Harding is definitely pledged to the former course of action by his pre-election speeches to the electorate, never seems to enter into anybody's head. What are political promises between a President and his advisers? As a matter of fact, of course, Mr. Harding has not the slightest notion of what he wants, or ought to do. He finds his party divided between the Hughes-Hoover group upon the one hand and the Knox-Borah group upon the other, and strives strenuously to keep the balance even between the two. The result is a see-saw—while Europe perishes!

We commend to our readers the appeal for an international conference on the reduction of armaments, issued on May 8th by four of the largest religious organizations in the country—the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the United Synagogue of America. This appeal, thus isued jointly by Protestants, Catholics and Jews, calls upon more than 100,000 clergymen to address their congregations on June 5th, and secure, if possible, resolutions addressed to Congress urging "the imperative necessity" of an international conference for the disarming of the nations. The answer from these clergymen should be one to shake the nation and the world! "If the churches cannot agree upon this," says Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, to whom credit is given for the inception of this movement, "it will not be done. . . . If the clergymen of the United States want to secure a limitation of armaments, they can do it now without any further waste of time. . . . If another war like the last one should come, they will be responsible for every drop of blood that will be shed and for every dollar expended." This is language none too strong! The women have acted upon this disarmament question. The farmers have acted. Now it remains for the churches to complete the work thus so well begun. The disarmament movement is farther advanced in the public mind today than ever before in recent history; if the churches cannot lead this movement to victory now, they might as well go out of business. Sunday, June 5th, is the appointed day! On that day let every pulpit speak, and every congregation act!

Elbert Russell, director of the Woolman School, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, makes a constructive suggestion in proposing the organization of a federal Department of Peace. With gigantic forces of the government organized in Army and Navy Departments, to no other purpose than that of threatening the security of other countries in the name of national defence, it seems little enough to ask that something definite be done to win and hold the friendship of foreign peoples, and thus blaze a path to peace! Is it not reasonable also to hope that, with hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated every year for the support of armaments on land and sea, a few hundreds of thousands of dollars might be found for the support of works of amity and con-

cord? Whether or no, Dr. Russell makes his proposal, in forthright Quaker fashion, and we wish that it might have the endorsement of all Americans. What such a Department of Peace might do, is not far to seek. Dr. Russell would have it take cognizance of all cases of need throughout the world, and direct to the relief of these cases a force of workers "as inoffensive to the pride and liberties of other peoples as the Red Cross."

They should be engineers, financial experts, administrators, teachers, missionaries, editors, physicians, nurses and statesmen. He (the secretary) should have direction of the Red Cross. The American consuls should report to him all cases of need in other nations; famine and floods, conflagrations and earthquakes; oppression and destitution that breed desperation and threaten riot and revolution—such as the taking of the peons' land by fraud in Mexico or the present hunger of Eastern Europe; race friction and national hatreds, such as produced the Boxer uprising in China, the second Balkan war and now disturb relations with Japan in California and Australia; incipient revolution, due to despotic abuse of power or personal political ambition, such as often cause civil wars in Latin America; plagues and epidemics, which threaten the health and impede the commerce of the world, like the Spanish influenza, the bubonic plague in India and typhus in Poland and Russia; ignorance and superstition, such as make popular government so difficult in Mexico; acts of aggression or policies of irritation on the part of Americans holding concessions or doing business in foreign countries; and all other conditions that threaten the internal peace and welfare of less favored nations or which might involve us in conflict with other peoples.

The secretary of peace would then use the forces at his disposal in a way to help the needy peoples without any suspicion of aggression or evil designs against their rights, territory or sovereignty on our part. By such measures we would most securely protect ourselves from attack or aggression.

The celebration in France of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Napoleon may not improperly be described as a demonstration of the reality of French militarism. It may equally well be accepted, however, as a perfectly normal reaction of human nature to the challenge of a man whose genius in the field of action overtops that of any other man who ever lived, whose deeds affected to good or ill every phase of modern life, and whose career presents a drama unsurpassed in splendor, renown and tragedy. The "little Corsican" bestrides the world of our time like a colossus. He catches the imagination of Germany and England quite as much as of France, and holds the pacifist equally with the militarist in his thrall. Just to the extent that men love energy, audacity, heroism, consummate imagination, towering reaches of intellect and will, they must ever hold Nepoleon in splendid memory. Even Emerson felt the spell of his genius, and Channing was moved to unwonted invective by the unwelcome consciousness of the sheer greatness of the man whom he denounced. Of moral character, of course, the Emperor had none. No supreme historical character ever lived who was so naturally devoid of conscience. Wells is quite right in stating in his "Outline" that he represents the exact antithesis of Jesus of Nazareth. Had this spirital element been in him, it is paralyzing to think of what he might have accomplished. The dream of all the ages, a free and united world, would not have been beyond the capacity of such a man. As it was, his career, well begun in the overthrow of European feudalism, spent itself in endless wars and futile lusts of empire; and ended, as it started, in the obscurity of a lone island of the sea.

It begins to look as though the twelve-hour day in the steel industry were doomed! On April 18th, at a meeting of stockholders, Judge Gary declared that "the officers of the Corporation, the presidents of the subsidiary companies, and a majority of others in positions of responsibility, are in favor of abolishing the twelve-hour day." On May 4, in connection with the great wage reduction throughout the industry, came the announcement that "after long and painstaking effort, we have not been able to find a practicable basis for entire abandonment of the twelve-hour day, or turn, in the immediate future. However, we have already eliminated the twelve-hour day in certain departments and shall continue our efforts in this direction, with the hope and expectation of making the elimination of the twelve-hour day complete during the next year." Is this a belated result of the strike in 1920? Is it the fruits of the great "Report" of the Interchurch Movement? To our minds, the answer to these questions is indubitably in the affirmative. The Steel Trust has been brought under the indictment of the public conscience, and is yielding to the glacier-like pressure of that conscience. This is an encouraging sign of what is still possible in the field of labor reform, even in times like these.

The announcement that the graduating class at Yale has voted Lloyd-George to be the greatest world-figure of the present day, is most appropriately followed by the news-story of Thomas A. Edison's utter despair over the ignorance of the college students who come to his laboratories for employment. The idea that young men and women in America go to college for an education, we confess to have long since abandoned. If there is any one thing more conspicuous than the abyssmal ignorance of the average "grad," it is the indifference and even contempt of this same "grad" for everything that we mean by learning. College is not a place to acquire knowledge. Rather is it a safe and happy refuge where one may loaf with the "fellows," flirt with the girls, yell at the football game, and acquire that reputation for respectability which is so necessary a condition of success in business and the professions. To go to college is "the thing" these days, and therefore everybody goes! But that a college was once seriously regarded, and is still politely described, as "an insti-

tution of learning," has been forgotten by all but a remnant of American youth. Yet perhaps this remnant may be a "saving remnant." We certainly thought so, some weeks ago, when we attended the meeting of the College Liberal League at Cambridge, and saw what those hundreds of young people were thinking about!

It is good news that the new Polish situation guarantees a large measure of religious liberty to the citizens of that country. This is a particularly happy circumstance from the standpoint of the Jews who have their homes within the borders of Poland. All that the Jews desired has not been won. The proposals of their deputies "that the constitution should clearly provide against discrimination on the ground of nationality or religion," were rejected, but a clause safeguarding freedom in religion was incorporated in the constitution, and thus insures all religions, Jewish and Christian alike, equal standing before the law. It is, of course, not surprising that the Catholics should have something more than an equal standing with their fellows. for Catholic influence is strong among the dominant classes in Polish society. On the whole, however, what has been achieved marks a real gain, and more than might have been expected in view of existing circumstances. The Pole is a strange combination of qualities. No man loves more deeply, or fights more valiantly, for liberty for himself, or grants liberty to others with a more unhappy grace.

The latest collection of statistics bearing on the question of the supply of ministers for Protestant churches, is offered by Dr. E. Guy Talbot in *The Christian Work*. It presents an appalling picture for those of us who still believe in organized religion. Thus, the largest demonimation in the country has one-fourth of all its pulpits today supplied by men who are not regular ministers. Another great denomination has 2,000 pulpits vacant. Still another had more than 3,300 of its churches without pastoral care in 1920. The reason for such a state of affairs Dr. Talbot finds in the inadequate provision made for the support of clergymen. Men will not enter a profession in which the average salary last year was $937! Such an explanation is pertinent, so far as it goes—but why not seek what lies behind it? Why is it that the remuneration offered to the Protestant minister today is so disgracefully low? There was a time when the pastor's salary was not altogether out of proportion to the cost of living. He was never a millionaire; but, on the other hand, he was never a beggar. Today, however—to quote Dr. Talbot—"the preacher must live in poverty and look forward (in his old age) to charity." In spite of the most strenuous efforts in recent years to improve conditions, the income of the average clergyman has gone up only a few per cent, while the cost of living has risen from 100 to 150 per cent. From such a situation only one inference is possible, namely, that Protestantism is steadily declining in influence and power. *The churches cannot support their ministers because they in turn are not being supported by the people.* Their income is proportionately much less today than it was fifty years ago. What this means fifty years hence, is obvious. More than half of our Protestant churches, while still listed in denominational year-books and counted in membership totals, will be closed for lack of ministers and congregations!

A Program of Church Reform

Some weeks ago we referred in these columns to the fact that we had been reproached by a reader, who was a distingished Dean of a theological seminary, for scolding the existing churches and then failing to give any program for their reform. We tried to indicate in our reply to this criticism that we had been busy ever since the day when we took editorial charge of the paper, in pressing the community church movement as the way out of the present difficulties of organized religion. We proved to the satisfaction of the great majority of our readers, we must believe, that we had printed an almost disproportionate number of editorials and articles interpreting the community idea of church reform, and had thus presented a program which, however unsatisfactory in itself, was still a *program*. We had not failed, in other words, to balance our criticism with constructive suggestions.

It might be well if this little controversy were dropped right here. We have to confess, however, that the reproach of our friend, the Dean, has been lingering with us, and that we have not been able to get away from the idea that we must have our share of responsibility for his judgment upon us. It cannot be that so intelligent and friendly a man would have altogether missed the program which we have in mind, if we had made it absolutely clear in our presentation. Somewhere, somehow, we have failed. Therefore do we propose to put ourselves on record herewith, so that there may be no slightest chance in the future for any honest person to declare that he has read our columns and found no program of a new church, to take the place of the old church which we so greatly detest and heartily reject. Behold now, brethren, this is what we would do if we had the power to reform the church world at a single stroke! This is our vision of what should come in the field of religious organization!

The church of which we dream, and which we

earnestly commend to those who would have our religious institutions survive in the changing order of our day, is the Community Church. This may be summarily described as an institution of religion organized in the spirit of democracy, and dedicated to the service of humanity. It is distinctive from existing churches in certain fundamental points, which we specify herewith.

I. The Community Church is characterized by loyalty to the social group as contrasted with loyalty to the single denomination.

Our existing churches are all denominational institutions. They are Baptist, or Presbyterian, or Unitarian, as the case may be. They are identified primarily, that is, with a certain historical movement in theological thought or ecclesiastical organization, and only secondarily with those basic community or social interests which comprise the fundamental life of the people. All this we would change by breaking up our denominations, or wiping them out altogether, and reforming the churches in such ways that they would comprise an institution as truly expressive of our democratic society as, for example, the great institution of the state. To accomplish this revolution in church order or affiliation would, of course, mean the transformation of our whole religious life. The church would represent a gathering not of those persons who are interested in the advancement of a certain way of thinking or worshipping in religion, but of all who are living a common life and seeking a common ideal of human welfare. It would be composed not of large groups of separate institutions, competing for the favor of men on the basis of intellectual acceptance of common ideas and methods, but of a single group of unified institutions co-operating to the one end of a better world for better men. Under this plan of community, as contrasted with denominational, organization, that is, each city or town would have not a large array of churches, each primarily interested in presenting its own particular copyrighted idea of the universe and man's salvation to the public mind, but a single institution, with many branches perhaps, as closely identified with the needs and purposes of the community life as the school, or library, or community center. To get rid of the denomination as the unit of spiritual integration, and substitute therefor the community, is the first plank in our program of reform.

II. The Community Church is an institution composed of the public group of citizens, held together by common social interests, rather than a private group, held together by common theological beliefs or viewpoints. It excludes none from its fellowship, but welcomes all, regardless of sect, class, nation, or race, on a basis of membership identical with that of citizenship in the community.

The basic trouble with the typical Protestant church, from the standpoint of its organization, at least, is the fact that it is essentially private and not public in character. Of course it pretends to be public, as witness its open doors on Sunday mornings, when it welcomes all who will come to its services of worship. But the test of the church's character in this regard is the organization not of its congregation but of its membership. When we come to the question of joining a church as a member in good and regular standing, we discover immediately that the church, after all, is nothing but a private club with strict conditions of membership which must be complied with, before admission to its fold can be granted. These conditions may involve the acceptance of the articles of a creed, or conformity to prescribed practices of worship, or general sympathy with certain theological or spiritual habits of mind. They run all the way from the rigid terms of orthodoxy to the tenuous and intangible terms of modern liberalism. In essence, however, they all mean the same thing—that an applicant for membership in a church must "belong," so to speak, before he can be received. The church, in other words, is an institution controlled by a private group of persons who strive to keep it faithful to the service of a certain purpose or ideal; and all who will not conform to what this group desires or intends, are rigorously excluded from membership. In this regard, the church is exactly like a political club, or a literary society, or a social reform organization.

The Community Church, on the other hand, is public in the sense that it deliberately undertakes to make its membership coincident with the citizenship in the community in which it is planted. This church has no terms of admission into its fellowship, theological or otherwise. Any man who desires to enter its doors and stand before its altars, may do so, with no questions asked and no conditions exacted. He is as free to come to this church and exercise his rights of membership, as he is free to take his child to the public school to receive the advantages of education, or himself to go to the public library and read its books and magazines. Of course, every citizen in the community will not necessarily exercise his membership in the Community Church. This is a matter of his own individual choice, just as it is similarly a matter of choice as to whether he will take books out of the library or visit the public art gallery. The point is that if he wants to do so, he can! Nobody in the church can exclude him, for there are no conditions of exclusion, as there are none of admission. Indeed, these very words, exclusion and admission, are out of place in this whole discussion, for a citizen is already in the community church by virtue of the fact that he is in the community. At bottom, of course, this means the reunion of church and state;

but in this there is no peril, in the case of the church unbound by theological dogmas or ecclesiastical tyrannies. Says Prof. Durant Drake, in his new book, "Shall We Stand by the Church?"

> The union of church and state was dangerous so long as the church was autocratic and dogmatic; make it democratic, a federation of free local organizations; make it undogmatic, a place where thought may be free and fearless; and we can again let it become an institution belonging to the community as a whole.

III. The Community Church is characterized by the free spirit, as contrasted with those restrictions of creed, ritual or ecclesiastical organization, which are dominant to a greater or less degree in all existing churches, both orthodox and liberal. The Community Church relegates all matters of theology and worship where they belong, namely, to the unfettered thought and conviction of the individual.

We are just beginning to catch a glimpse of the wonderful idea that theology has no place in the church as an institution. Properly speaking, theology belongs only to the individual, since thought is necessarily based on experience, and experience necessarily is confined to the limits of a single life. Each individual must believe something about the universe in which he lives and therefore must have a theology; but a church cannot have a theology, save as a few individuals impose their ideas upon their fellows, or all of them together engage in the nefarious business of compromise for the sake of an agreement which must at the very best be as unstable as it is dishonest. Theology, by which we mean religious philosophy, has no more place in the church than political philosophy has in the state. What would we think, for example, if men should suddenly undertake to impose the political creed of the Republican Party upon this nation, to the end that all citizens would have to be Republicans as a condition of retaining their citizenship. What did we think when, in New York State a year ago, an attempt was made to identify that commonwealth with the orthodox political philosophy of the Democratic and Republican parties to such an extent that Socialists were not allowed to send their chosen representatives to the Assembly at Albany. Such things, of course, we easily recognize in our sober moments as being out-and-out betrayals of the ideals of our national life. America is not a Republican, or a Democratic, or a Socialistic state. It is altogether outside of existing political philosophies. Individual men can be Democrats, Republicans, or Socialists, if they will, and they can join themselves into working groups for the advancement of their ideas, if they so choose; but any attempt to seize the state and make it wholly Republican, or Democratic, or Socialistic, would be the end of our great experiment in democracy. The essence of this democracy is the free spirit—the right of every citizen, without jeopardizing his citizenship, to think as he will upon matters political.

The same thing should be true of the church. Members of the church, like citizens of the state, should be left free to work out their own theories of truth and progress. In other words, there should be no theology—that is, religious philosophy—in the church itself, just as there is no political philosophy in the state. In our spiritual, as in our social life, we must be free to worship our own God, and seek our own kingdom of the spirit.

IV. The Community Church accepts the social group instead of the individual as the object of salvation. It interprets religion fundamentally in terms of social reconstruction, and dedicates its members to the fulfillment of social idealism.

In this respect the Community Church is as new as the age in which we are at present living. All existing churches, both liberal and orthodox, are concerned primarily with the individual. The orthodox churches would convert him, and thus make over the old man into the new. The liberal churches would educate this individual, believing that in substance he is sound and needs only proper guidance and inspiration. The Community Church, per contra, regards the individual not primarily as an individual, subject to conversion or education, but as a member of a social group which itself stands in need of reconstruction. Programs of social change, therefore, rather than methods of individual regeneration, constitute the prime interest of the Community Church. It feels certain that if men are only permitted to be born and reared in a healthy environment, to live under the just administration of wise laws, to work and serve in a society which knows no private interests but only public ideals, they will themselves find it easy to practice the ways of righteousness and love. Not to run from the City of Destruction, as Bunyan's "Christian" did, in order to save his own soul, but to stay and preserve this city from destruction, so that salvation will be inside instead of outside its walls —this is the new vision of religious idealism! Jesus, after all, was rght when he said, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and all things else shall be added to you."

V. This Community Church, of which we dream, has the idea of universal religion, as contrasted with the prevalent idea of Christianity as a religion of particular or special revelation.

It regards the religious instinct as inherent in human nature. Man is incurably religious and inevitably seeks to give expression to the spiritual passions that flame within his soul. It is this which has produced the great variety of religions which have been offered in different ages and places, and under the inspiration of different prophets, as con-

tributions to the fulfillment of man's higher life. All these religions are to be regarded as, within their limits, sound and good. All are to be gathered up as a part of the sum total of human experience in the spiritual realm. No one of them, not even Christianity itself, can be regarded as the perfect or final expression of man's spirit to the exclusion of all others. The Community Church, therefore, identifies itself with religion, and not with any one of the many religions which have appeared in the course of the ages of human history. All bibles, all prophets, all churches, are included within the scope of its sympathy and the warmth of its love. Christians, Jews, Hindus, Mohammedans, Buddhists, are accepted within the circles of its fellowship. Its faith is a universal faith; and its religion, the religion of humanity.

VI. Other points distinctive of the Community Church, as contrasted with other churches, easily suggest themselves. Thus this church undertakes to substitute for the theistic the humanistic point of view, since man is the center of its life and the object of its service; for absorption in the next world, dedication to the needs and interests of this world; for the church as a sacred institution, the idea of present society as fulfilling on earth the Kingdom of God, the commonwealth of man. This church for the new age may be described in brief as the practical acknowledgment of religion as the spirit of love incarnate in human fellowship. The core of its faith, as the purpose of its life, is "The Beloved Community."

This is our idea of the church that is to come. This is the church which we would substitute in place of the churches which are now struggling and failing to win the allegiance of man. This is our program of religious reconstruction for this age of dwindling faith and eager hope. Let no man say that we criticize the historic church in vain. We do this from no feeling of petty spite, or pessimistic cynicism, or cruel hate; but from profound conviction that the churches organized as they are today on lines strictly theological, are doomed to perish, and that a new church must be created if organized religion is not altogether to perish. We sum up our conclusion by quoting again the word of Prof. Drake of Vassar College:

"The church of the future," he says, "must be taken away from sectarian control, and run as the schools are, by the community, as a public concern too important to be left to private interests. (If this were done) we might perhaps see a renaissance of religion parallel to the development of education since that great field of human activity passed into the hands of the public. . . . Whatever the exact plan . . . we must have patience, good temper, we must be opportunists, glad to take any step that seems immediately useful in any place, and willing to tolerate confusion for a long time yet. But eventually, as Dr. J. E. McAfee has declared, 'Religion, like every other universal human concern, must be brought under community control, if democracy is fully to vindicate itself'."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

THE TUFT OF FLOWERS.

I went to turn the grass once after one
Who mowed it in the dew before the sun.

The dew was gone that made his blade so keen
Before I came to view the levelled scene.

I looked for him behind an isle of trees;
I listened for his whetstone on the breeze.

But he had gone his way, the grass all mown,
And I must be, as he had been,—alone,

"As all must be," I said within my heart,
"Whether they work together or apart."

But as I said it, swift there passed me by
On noiseless wing a bewildered butterfly,

Seeking with memories grown dim over night
Some resting flower of yesterday's delight.

And once I marked his flight go round and round,
As where some flower lay withering on the ground.

And then he flew as far as eye could see,
And then on tremulous wing came back to me.

I thought of questions that have no reply,
And would have turned to toss the grass to dry;

But he turned first, and led my eye to look
At a tall tuft of flowers beside a brook,

A leaping tongue of bloom the scythe had spared
Beside a reedy brook the scythe had bared.

I felt my place to know them by their name,
Finding them butterfly-weed when I came.

The mower in the dew had loved them thus,
By leaving them to flourish, not for us,

Nor yet to draw one thought of ours to him,
But from sheer morning gladness at the brim.

The butterfly and I had lit upon,
Nevertheless, a message from the dawn,

That made me hear the wakening birds around,
And hear his long scythe whispering to the ground,

And feel a spirit kindred to my own;
So that henceforth I worked no more alone;

But glad with him, I worked as with his aid,
And weary, sought at noon with him the shade;

And dreaming, as it were, held brotherly speech
With one whose thought I had not hoped to reach.

"Men work together," I told him from the heart,
"Whether they work together or apart."

—*Robert Frost.*

The call is for men and women who will follow the way of the cross with the same courage and abandon with which the soldier serves his country, who are willing to risk everything for the Kingdom of God, who have learned to count all things loss for Christ's sake, and who will follow his way of life without qualification or compromise.

To increase the number of men and women in all lands who will refuse absolutely to sanction the use of any unchristian weapon, who will follow without compromise the teaching and example of Jesus Christ, and who will seek diligently by every possible means to spread abroad in the lives of individuals and of nations the spirit of Jesus, this is the only sure way to abolish war.—*Kirby Page.*

From "The Sword or the Cross."

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

[The following article by George Willis Cooke, entitled "Individual and Society," is introductory to a series of essays on great radical leaders in the field of world literature in the nineteenth century. These essays will be published in these columns from week to week. The first, which is to follow immediately this introduction, is on Rousseau; then will follow George Sand, Victor Hugo, Mazzini, Wagner, Tolstoi, Ibsen, Shelley, Ruskin and Walt Whitman. Others may follow later on. We count ourselves fortunate in being able to present this valuable material to our readers. THE EDITORS.]

Individual and Society

Any considerable study of modern literature must convince the investigator that social problems have come more and more to find a place in it as dominating its tendencies. A very large proportion of the great writers have been concerned with the relations of the individual and society, the position of the worker, marriage, the nature of human progress or in criticism of existing conditions. Religion as an evolutionary process has also had its influence in determining the nature of literary expression. Cosmopolitanism or internationalism has inspired many an author; and, while patriotism has proved to be a great inspiration, the idea of the unity of mankind and the interrelation of nations, has had its charm for many a poet and novelist. The conception of the superman, who is to lead mankind to heights it has never yet attained, has claimed its propagandists.

The tendency has been to emphasize the importance of the individual, or, on the other hand, to assert the predominance of society. Strange as it may seem, as coming from an autocratic nation, where individual freedom has had no place, it is in Russia that we find the extremist assertion of individualism. From that country has come all the great anarchists —Bakounin, Kropotkin and Tolstoi. The very attempt to suppress all freedom of expression of thought in that country has evidently had the effect of developing the rankest form of individual self-assertion. Anarchism develops best where there is the least of liberty; and its violence is in proportion to its rigid suppression.

On the other hand, France is the country in which society as a social force has had the largest measure of recognition. Beginning with Rousseau a continuous succession of great writers have put forth the idea that society itself is the main fact in the life of humanity. Such novelists as Balzac, the Goncourts, Victor Hugo, Zola and their successsors have emphasized the fact of the collective life, the dominating influence of the social group, human institutions, the state, humanity itself. For instance, Balzac was greatly impressed by the nature of the interrelations and dependence of individuals; hence his "Human Comedy." Victor Hugo, in his first great novel, "Notre Dame of Paris," recognized the extent to which that temple of religion was the center of the city's life, and the institution around which all its interests revolved.

The leading sociologists of France, as in the instance of Tarde and Durkheim, have found in society itself, in social institutions, the influence which is most important and most creative. The individual is secondary, the product of society, which moulds him to whatever he may become. Therefore we find throughout French literature this recognition of what is communal, institutional, national and humanitarian. If individualism found its first distinct and most emphatic expression in England, it is equally true that socialism, collectivism, the idea of the dominance of the group, first came to a large and scientific expression in France. Not the less has it found there its fullest assertion in literature. This may be because French life has always centered in Paris, because the nation has revolved around that cosmopolitan city, and because to name Paris has been to characterize France and the French people.

One of the first thinkers to give definite expression to this social ideal was Montesquieu, as stated in his "Spirit of Laws." He was followed by, and largely influenced, Rousseau, in his "Social Contract" and other works. At first Rousseau was a most positive individualist; but later on he came to be predominantly a collectivist. It is not surprising, therefore, that both the anarchists and the socialists look to him as first setting forth their fundamental conceptions of the relations of the individual and society. He was undoubtedly a collectivist in his most matured thought, but he remained all his life ready to assert the rights of the individual and the initiative which must be his.

It would seem that in a degree all modern literature has been influenced by Rousseau; and his ideas assert themselves in endless forms, and with a persistency which seems inevitable. At least this is true, that modern literature circles endlessly about this problem of the relations of the individual and society. If Tolstoi asserts the initiative of the individual, even to the extent of becoming an anarchist, Gorky is not the less dominated by the social, to the extent of becoming predominantly a socialist. If Ibsen is the great champion of individual freedom, claiming this for women as well as for men, and insisting that the crowd is always in the wrong, while the individual is always in the right; his contemporary, Bjornson, saw the world of man much more distinctly from the social point of view, even being essentially a collectivist. Even Ibsen himself, emphatically individualist as he was in his greatest plays, could not refrain from declaring himself in his letters as in sympathy with socialism.

The most uncompromising assertion of individualism is to be found in the writings of Nietzsche. Here we have the most critical condemnation of all tendencies to collectivism. For him the crowd, the vulgar human mass, is imbecile and intellectually impotent. It is the superman, the man born to a superior power of mind, who must control the herd, and lead mankind to its heights. Another German, the great tone-poet, Wagner, was led quite to the opposite conception of the nature of the relations of the individual to society, and saw in social tradition the creative process of society itself, the leading cause of all human progress, as well as of all true creation in art and literature. This was undoubtedly the reason why these two men, fast friends for a time, drew widely apart in their enmity of later years.

If Byron was self-assertive, combatting society and all its prejudices and its institutions, not the less was Shelley collectivist in every word he wrote. If Words-

worth saw man in his individual aspects, he had many a successor, as Ruskin, Morris and George Eliot, who preferred to conceive of him as a member of society.

This also is to be recognized, that in modern literature, growing out of this contention between the individual and society, there is a large degree of revolt, criticism of existing conditions, and demand for a reconstruction of society. Sometimes this demand is made in behalf of the individual, that he may have more freedom and initiative; and again it is in the form of a plea for a larger measure of social regeneration, more of unity and fellowship. Pleas against poverty, in behalf of a larger conception of marriage, a wiser control of property, a society juster and more ethical, larger liberty for the individual, freer opportunities for initiative—these are some of the demands from the one side or the other. Moral conduct, religious ideals, the nature and functions of the state, what society is and how it can best secure desirable results—one or another of these problems may be found presented in the writings of every great poet, novelist, and dramatist. These problems, and many akin to them, are of so vital a nature, that all books which have meaning and a lasting power are likely to be dominated by them in some form.

It is to be recognized that the English revolution of 1649, the American revolution of 1776, and the French revolution of 1789, were essentially political in their character, a change in the form of government. The revolutionary movements in Europe in 1848 were less political than social, not so much a demand for change in government as in the nature of society. They were industrial, economic, reformatory of social customs and institutions, and sought for a reconstruction of society itself. A change in the form of government may have very little effect in reforming abuses or in mitigating social evils. Only a reforming of society itself can have a salutary effect on the lives of the people, in making their lot more just and hopeful.

Revolutions are possible only because governments will not accept the need for reform, and insist that what exists is most desirable and not to be improved. If governments were progressive, ready to mitigate existing conditions, responsive to the demands for reform and progress, no revolutions would ever take place. Invariably revolutions are caused by the bigotry and the stubbornness of governments, that they will not anticipate the need for growth and change.

We may accept it as true that Rousseau did not produce by his writings the French revolution, as some critics have asserted. Nor is it true that Tolstoi brought on the Russian revolution of 1905 or that of 1917. What was done by these and other great writers was to voice the demands of the time in which they lived, to serve as the mouthpieces of the people's desire for change and progress. In our own day, if we study widely the literature which interprets the wishes of the people, their call for reform and advance, we may readily comprehend that for which the age is striving. This demand is not for radical changes in the forms of government, though it includes this; but it is for an evolution of society itself along rational and ethical lines of progress. We have reached the point where society may shape its own future within the limits of the material environment, and this is the demand which is finding a many-voiced expression.

It is proposed to consider in succeeding articles some of the great authors who have voiced and are voicing the demands of modern society for a more humane and rational form of social life. Attention will be given to the manner in which they have dealt with the more important of the social problems of our time. Among these authors will be Rousseau, Tolstoi, Ibsen, Walt Whitman, and several others. Their literary qualities and characteristics will not be ignored; but chief attention will be given to the manner in which they have dealt with social problems, and especially with the relations of the individual and society.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

The Unknown Dead

France and England have wept in public over the unknown dead. Elaborate burial rites have been lavished upon the ashes of a nameless soldier to symbolize heroic death. And a similar emotional extravaganza will be enacted on American soil next November, and Armistice Day will remain an occasion for celebrating war rather than peace.

According to the papers, it is proposed to send the battleship Olympia to convey the remains of the unknown dead, ironically guarded by non-commissioned officers of the army, navy and marine corps. The cost, according to ex-Secretary Baker, will be a trifle of $187,000.

The ceremony in London was elaborately photographed, and the penny pictorials have preserved for the edification of posterity the countenances of the great ones who participated, among them Grey, Asquith and Lloyd George, architects of the general ruin, as they filed past the flag-draped coffin. E. D. Morel has described the scene:

> As I write these lines reverent crowds are still passing before the bier of the unknown warrior, and an endless procession of mourners moves slowly towards the Cenotaph. Nearly all carry flowers. Many women have babies in their arms. Parents lead small children by the hand—small children upon whom sentence of premature death is even now being passed behind closed doors. Every face wears the imprint of sadness, even those of the burly policemen who shepherd the crowd with the utmost kindness and tact. The heart tightens. What is in the mind of this slow-pacing throng? The image of those they have lost? Yes; but beyond this? Any shaking of the fatalistic sentimentalism which assents resignedly to the sacrifice? Any perception that in a dozen other countries there are similar stricken masses? Any revolt against the *fiat* which orders this universal immolation of youth? Any doubt of the "rightness" of the "cause"? Oh! vastness of human credulity! Oh! mysteriousness of the power of single minds working on the malleable mass-mind through the printed word! . . . When shall this curtain of perverted symbolism, false allegory and idealism misapplied be rent in twain, so that, seeing, they shall see verily, and hearing, they shall understand? When shall they enter the kingdom of Truth, pull down with their own strong hands the Temple of the God of Nationalism and rear a temple to Mankind upon its ruins?

The opponents of war have always been accused of sentimentalism because of their insistence upon the sacredness of human life, but it would be hard to exceed the sentimentality of the worshippers of violence when engaged in their patriotic ritual, or when they give rein to their stimulated emotions, as in the instance of spectacular mourning for the unknown soldier. Yet one has only to ask what was the actual

attitude of the subject of this extraordinary apotheosis to reveal the hollowness of the mummery.

Was he a professional soldier, a human soul bought and paid for (at bargain rates), and guaranteed to obey and not to reason why? Or was he, perchance, a man who had been unfortunate enough to outgrow the taste for cannibalism, a conscript whose repugnance to the disgusting business of murder received no more consideration from the civil and military authorities than the fears of the constitutionally timid? What could be more grotesquely absurd than this pompous ceremonial over the ashes of one unwillingly conscripted, or one who may have been the target of the firing squad? Indeed, it is not impossible that the remains in the casket might be claimed by a dead enemy whose bones were indistinguishable from those of his adversaries in the promiscuous wreckage of the battlefield.

Authority, no doubt, depends upon the infatuation of pride to keep the living from counting the cost of war as long as they are diverted by military pageants. The mourners in the throng accept the display as honoring their own dead, not suspecting that they are taking part in the exploitation of anthropophagous instinct by the political organism, which finds its natural sustenance in the propaganda of death.

If the dead soldier was one who enlisted, fired with the noble enthusiasm of high thoughts—defence of the weak and oppressed, the extension of democracy and the abolition of war—the mockery is not less but greater, since the net result of a wealth mistaken idealism has been to tighten the grip of evil in the world and to extend the range of violence. Having thrown away their lives, their very ashes are now being made instruments for the enslavement of another generation of young men; for who can doubt that the purpose of this costly pageantry is the perpetuation of the war spirit. It is a variation on the parades and flags and medals, calculated to stir the martial complex and to keep the embers glowing in readiness for the next conflict.

No one can predict the result of the wave of emotion that will roll through the country on November 11. It is well known to what ignoble reactions emotions are subject when once aroused by religious revivals. The mind so inflamed is dangerously open to suggestion, and in the present condition of society may easily be led on to fresh exhibitions of intolerance and appeals to lynch law. The legal power of intimidation being temporarily in abeyance, it is sought to suppress criticism by threatening with mob violence anyone who would dare to discuss the Horror on the Rhine, or to signalize Armistice Day by confessing, with Captain Edward Gill, that wars do not settle anything, and that, having "failed to win the ideals that we thought could be won by the use of force, we must turn to other weapons."

Such ideas will be effectively suppressed during the patriotic exercises, and few will question the right of authority to speak for the unknown dead, whose ghost was pictured by Lucien Laforge gazing in shadowy outline at his impressive tomb and murmuring, "I did not want so much. I only wanted to live."

FRANK W. GARRISON.

"Don't you find writing a thankless job?" "On the contrary, everything I write is returned to me with thanks."—*Fligende Blatter.*

War and Insanity

Somewhat more than two years have elapsed since the day in November, 1918, that brought the cessation of the mad violence which had raged for more than four years in an area considered one of the centers of the highest civilization known to mankind. When the war came to an end certain direct and inevitable consequences manifested themselves which are still with us and seem likely to affect society for a long time to come. And of the many calamitous and diverse consequences of the war none is more serious than the unbalancing effect upon the human mind. At the present time one evidence of this is the "crime wave" which is distinctly an after-effect of the late war and by which almost every nation claiming the highest degree of civilization is being deluged.

That there is always increase in crime after a war is a well-known fact. Crime in unusual proportion and disease epidemics of extreme severity invariably follow in the wake of war so that both moral and physical degeneracy are widespread throughout every nation that has engaged in conflict. It is not necessary that war should be international in order to have an abnormal increase in crime as an aftermath. Crime was rampant in the United States after our civil war, and records show that it prevailed to an unusual degree for a period of fully twenty years. In those days the criminals did not center their demonstrations in cities as they have recently done. The great West offered an attractive field just then for the activities of desperadoes, and holding up stage-coaches and railway trains were among their favorite pastimes. I remember as a child hearing of many such exploits and wondering, horror-stricken, about them. I little dreamed then that a war, whose one splendid result was the liberation of millions of human beings from slavery, could be responsible also for the production of outlaws and criminals of such dreaded types.

An era wherein society is terrorized by crimes whose extent and damage are practically incalculable is only one of the heart-sickening and inevitable consequences of war. We have become accustomed, though I trust not hardened, to the idea of sick and crippled men as a by-product of war; men more or less physically disabled, or afflicted with some chronic condition of disease destined to ruin forever the futures of thousands of promising lives. But as one result of the last war a form of malady which at first might seem somewhat unusual is at the front to demand close consideration. I was attracted lately by a headline in a daily paper which read: "Many Veterans Mentally Ill." Then came the statement that fully forty per cent of the disabled discharged soldiers were suffering from some sort of mental derangement.* This of course is not entirely new as an after-effect of war, for many highly-strung young souls have lost their mental poise on fields of battle in the past. But the proportion as now given of forty per cent among all disabled soldiers is terrifying. We may well believe that the blame for this portentous proportion is due to the new, strange methods of warfare employed in the world war which intensified the horrors of conflict. That adequate provision by the government has not been made for these and thousands of other cases of disability of returned sol-

*Public Health Service Reports, by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, La Porte.

diers is not my present concern. What I want here to emphasize is that war turns men's heads, and that the abnormal mental conditions produced by war in thousands upon thousands of cases evidence themselves either in some variety of mental derangement recognizable by physicians, or in deeds that are tabulated upon the plane of crime. Those of the former class are restrained, while the as yet unrecognized criminals are turned loose though they need as vigilant care as the class of acknowledged dementia. And the letting loose upon society of thousands of criminally inclined whose example may affect great numbers of others of weak or unstable morality cannot be lightly disregarded.

No one can reasonably deny the existence of other causes than war for the criminals, and criminally inclined, in our midst. But that war increases enormously the numbers of that dangerous class cannot be gainsaid with truth. And not only war itself but the training for war counts in the same direction. The fact cannot be waived aside without having stern retribution pile up at compound interest for the future that the training which provides men for future warfare is at the same time breeding future criminals. The daily press everywhere may vigorously call public attention to the need of more stringent regulations that more careful safe-guarding of the community from the ravages of criminals may be effected, but what will that avail if the causes which produce the criminals are allowed to flourish unchecked—are even nourished and fostered! As well try to check an epidemic of typhoid in a town whose water supply continues to be polluted and to be used!

The science of psychology is said to be as yet in its infancy. Some one has likened it to an uncharted sea. But ignorance of its laws will excuse no man from the payment in full demanded by inexorable Nature when her laws are broken. Conditions due to a definite law, whether the law be known or unknown, cannot be ignored with safety. The time comes when symptoms are so aggravated that investigation becomes imperative and the cause must be found and removed if the patient is to survive. And the time has come now when the fact must be faced that the effect of warfare upon the human mind is disintegrating and leads to both insanity and criminality of all types and degrees. Just how much the mind is affected by warfare it is impossible to estimate; but the fact remains that the mind is affected not only by actual war but by the training which prepares for it. And not only the conscious intelligence but the sub-conscious mind is swayed and biased and schooled. The powers and tremendous influence of the subconscious mind are as yet far from being fully understood by even the best-informed students of psychology; but the more the sub-conscious mind is studied the more deeply is recognized the danger of violating the laws which govern its workings. And who shall say to what perilous degree the sub-conscious mind may be affected by the slow and subtle poison of being deliberately and scientifically taught to murder—to destroy human life!

How close the connection may really be between criminals and certain types of insane is still a questionable point. Over and again the statement has been made in times of peace that criminals were really more or less insane and in perhaps even a large majority of cases could hardly be held responsible for their behavior. Experts in mental diseases will admit unhesitatingly that the line is a most difficult one to draw which separates certain types of criminals from actual insanity. Is it an agreeable thought that the sane part of the community is at the mercy of thousands whose brains have become undependable, warped, actually unbalanced, yet who are at large to vent their vicious tendencies? And that men are systematically and intentionally being trained along the very lines that will produce still greater numbers of the same sort? Surely in a world on the verge of financial ruin, and with industry struggling to regain stability, the morality and mental poise of every individual becomes a vital matter.

That war seriously interferes with all forms of business by withdrawing hundreds of thousands of citizens from necessary and gainful occupations and thus bringing to a halt the widespread prosperity among the mass of the people of a country does not appear, so we may judge, to be sufficient reason for government officials and legislators to seek for means whereby it shall be immediately abolished. But that one result of war is the producing of hundreds of thousands of unbalanced brains in all degrees of unreason from actual or recognized forms of insanity to criminals of all shades and grades of types—is not this something to arrest the attention even of those few whose policy so far has dominated the world, even though their material prosperity may be temporarily increased by war? That all of these additional thousands of insane and criminals become public charges—or should so become—and at enormous expense if decently and humanely cared for; that society is thus deprived of their useful labor not merely during wartime but for an indefinite period after the close of hostilities; all this may count for naught with those who still believe in war and in keeping up the preparations for future war. But that the numbers of such disqualified men are vastly greater than is generally realized and cannot be accurately estimated there is no doubt, and it really might be the part of wisdom to weigh that fact in the balance when pros and cons regarding war and its continuance are considered.

Besides the victims of the war-madness already noted there is yet another class numbering—I am obliged to repeat an expression made familiar by previous usage—still other thousands on thousands. In response to the call for help from nations whose strength was failing in the recent war, many splendid young souls, eager, courageous, high-strung, fared away filled with the patriotic fervor which flames in every breast and the innate love of liberty and justice with which most of humanity seems endowed. Of these the greater part would not probably lose their mental control to such an extent that they would be classed as demented, and their quality of mind would be such that criminal misdemeanors would be out of the question. But they would find themselves affected strangely, tragically, by the surrounding chaos of horrors of actual conflict. Those of this type who returned to their homes and families knew of themselves that their mental balance was disturbed. They were affected in more varieties of ways than it would be possible to enumerate, but as a general thing they were rendered unfit for regular work, and their pleading cry, with slight variations, has been throughout the past two years: "I'm not quite myself yet; just

let me alone a while longer." Pitiful indeed the state of mental depression, of fear of vague terrors, of loss of possibility of normal concentration that has come to such a host of brave, earnest young minds whose outlook on life had been so high and inspiring!

The foregoing is as true of other nations as of our own. Does it all count for nothing with the high officials of governments and with legislators? Are they who hold the power going right on in the same old ways making preparations for possible future war which would multiply the numbers of unstable, untrustworthy citizens in every belligerent nation? What would the world come to should this sort of thing continue? And how long the pernicious influence of war may continue to affect harmfully the mental balance of people and of their posterity we have no means of knowing or estimating! The prediction of Mr. Hoover that "another war in our generation means the dissolution of society," I have construed as from the standpoint of economics and industry. But it might be advisable to give at least some slight consideration to the mental state of the people on whose faithful industry the economic situation depends. Not alone those who participate directly in battle but even those who remain at home are affected by the war-madness, for war shakes a nation to its foundations! It produces an hysteria, a "wave of hysteria," as it were, which in passing over a nation seems to unsettle the power of rational calm thought in many individuals among all classes and conditions of people. A noted authority says, "The social consequences of this present war have not yet been assessed nor faced. The resultant diseases may permanently impair the vitality of Europe,"* yet even this statement, while noting both "social consequences" and "resultant diseases," would not seem to include the disturbed mental state of a large part of the population.

I repeat that there is something about war that turns men's heads! For war is abnormal for human beings. Men are gregarious and find their best interests served and best development fostered by cooperation. War is in direct opposition to the laws under which human progress may be best achieved, and by working in opposition to those laws the human race is constantly keeping in check the powers which make for its progress—for the cultivation of its highest possibilities and capacities.

Let us not despair of humanity. When we consider the wars of past ages through which mankind has struggled, and in spite of whose evils we have reached our present development, we have every reason to believe in the innate and indomitable spark of divinity within the human being and to renew our faith in the marvelous possibilities of his achievement when the elements of retrogression shall have been removed. But they will not be removed until they are clearly perceived. War will not be dealt with rationally until it is seen to be itself irrational, demoralizing, and also dementalizing. To the realization that war is incompatible with democracy, with religion, with civilization, let it be added that war is incompatible with sanity itself. In literal fact war makes men crazy.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

*Prof. H. F. Ward, "The New Social Order," p. 377.

SELECTED

A Father's Letter

Theodore Roosevelt to His Son

From "Theodore Roosevelt's Letters to His Children." Copyrighted 1919 by Charles Scribner's Sons.

White House, January 21, 1904.

Dear Ted:—

This will be a long business letter. I sent to you the examination papers for West Point and Annapolis. I have thought a great deal over the matter, and discussed it at great length with Mother. I feel on the one hand that I ought to give you my best advice and yet on the other hand I do not wish to seem to constrain you against your wishes. If you have definitely made up your mind that you have an overmastering desire to be in the navy or in the army, and that such a career is the one in which you will take a really heartfelt interest—far more so than any other—and that your greatest chance for happiness and usefulness will lie in doing this one work to which you feel yourself especially drawn—why, under such circumstances, I have but little to say. But I am not satisfied that this is really your feeling. It seemed to me more as if you did not feel drawn in any other direction, and wondered what you were going to do in life or what kind of work you would turn your hand to, and wondered if you could make a success or not; and that you are therefore inclined to turn in the navy or army chiefly because you would then have a definite and settled career in life, and could hope to go on steadily without any great risk of failure. Now, if such is your thought, I shall quote to you what Captain Mahan said to his son when asked why he did not send him to West Point or Annapolis. "I have too much confidence in him to make me feel that it is desirable for him to enter either branch of the service."

In the army and navy the chance for a man to show great ability and rise above his fellows does not occur on the average more than once in a generation. When I was down at Santiago it was melancholy for me to see how fossilized and lacking in ambition, and generally useless, were most of the men of my age and over, who had served their lives in the army. The navy for the last few years has been better, but for twenty years after the Civil War there was less chance in the navy than in the army to practice, and do, work of real consequence. I have actually known lieutenants in both the army and the navy who were grandfathers—men who have seen their children married before they themselves attained the grade of captain. Of course the chance may come at any time when the man of West Point or Annapolis who will have stayed in the army or navy finds a great war on, and therefore has the opportunity to rise high. Under such circumstances, I think that the man of such training who has actually left the army or the navy has even more chance of rising than the man who has remained in it. Moreover, often a man can do as I did in the Spanish War, even though not a West Pointer.

The last point raises the question about you going to West Point or Annapolis and leaving the army or navy after you have served the regulation four years (I think that is the number) after graduation from the academy. Under this plan you would have an ex-

cellent education and a grounding in discipline and, in some ways, a testing of your capacity greater than I think you can get in any ordinary college. On the other hand, except for the profession of an engineer, you would have had nothing like special training, and you would be so ordered about, and arranged for that you would have less independence of character than you could gain from them. You would have had fewer temptations; but you would have had less chance to develop the qualities which overcome temptations and show that a man has individual initiative.

The Boy Scouts

During my peregrinations I once came across boys in uniform and asked them what their uniform meant. The answer was that they lived for God, King and country.

I suggested that he could not separate the bureaucracy from the King, that the King was an impersonal ideal existence which meant the British Empire, and that no Indian could remain loyal, in the accepted sense, to the Empire as it was at present represented and be loyal to God at the same time.

I continued my argument. "Supposing our country becomes godless in order to enrich itself, exploits other people, traffics in intoxicants, goes to war for the sake of extending its trade and resorts to fraud in order to sustain its power and prestige, how can we be consistently loyal to God and country? Must we not forsake the country for the sake of God? I suggest, therefore, that you should bind yourself to be faithful and loyal only to God and none else in the same sense and in the same breath."

There were many of his companions who were deeply interested in the conversation. Their chief, too, came in. I repeated my argument to him and asked him to tax himself and stimulate the inquiring spirit of the grown up young men whom he was guiding. Hardly was the absorbing topic exhausted, when the train steamed out of the station. I felt sorry for the splendid lads and understood better the deep meaning of the movement of Non-co-operation. There can be but one universal creed for man, that is loyalty to God. It includes, when it is not inconsistent, loyalty to King, country and humanity. But it equally often excludes all else. I hope that the youth of the country as well as their tutors will revise their creed and set themselves right where they are convinced of their error. It is no small matter for tender minds to have formulas presented to them which cannot bear scrutiny. *Gandhi.*

Young India, Calcutta.

SPIRITUS ÆTERNUS.

The woods are fragrant with Thy spirit's breath,
From every swaying tree-top calls Thy voice,
The gently flowing brooklet murmureth:
"Harken to this old secret and rejoice!

"There is no boundary 'tween thee and me,
All Life is one, there is no mine and thine,
Thou seé'st thyself in every blade and tree,
When thou hast glimpsed the Universe Divine!"

DOMBEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Day of Remembrance

Editor of UNITY:

Sir: The President has proclaimed the annual Memorial Day in honor of those who lost their lives in war. Meanwhile there are those who died serving their country in other and perhaps better ways than war. We detract nowise from the honor due our brave soldiers and sailors when we recognize that there may be occasions for sacrifice higher and worthier than war. Had the same courage, devotion and patriotism that appeared on the world's battlefields also existed in the world's parliaments and chancellories perhaps those calamities of civil and international strife would never have arisen.

We honor the memory of those who died in war though the quest of war is destruction, the necessity of war debatable, the benefits of war dubious. Shall we be any less ready to honor those who gave their lives in the performance of needful work whose quest is *con*struction; whose necessity is indisputable, whose benefits are obvious? We deck with flowers the grave of him whose task it was to shoot. Shall we leave undecked the grave of the miner who perished that the nation might have warmth, of the iron worker who perished that the nation might have shelter, of the engineer who perished that the nation might have transportation, of the nurse who perished that the nation might have health, or of the mother who perished that the nation might have life?

There should be a nation wide, yes a world wide, day of remembrance for those who died doing the works of upbuilding and of usefulness. The sweetest flowers should deck their graves. Their example should be held up to emulation. Eloquent orators should speak their praises and hymns of approval should be sung in every church and school.

ABRAHAM CRONBACH.

A Suggestion for Mr. Tinker's Correspondents

Dear UNITY:

Why do not Mr. Tinker's correspondents follow the course laid down in his first quotation? How can they expect an organization to tolerate what runs counter to the social prestige, the venerated interests, and the officially standardized harmlessness which seem to be characteristic of the Halycon ideal.

Recognition and promotion demand at least a becoming attitude towards denominational officials who, judged by the salary standard, are sometimes more capable than the average minister. It is surely also the duty of the latter to comport himself suitably toward generous contributors, to be assiduous along approved lines in furthering the time-honored policy of his superiors, and, as is only fitting, to keep on cordial terms with those who have special care of the church's vested inheritance.

Those wise counsellors on whose burdened shoulders lies the distasteful task of tactfully eliminating undenominational enthusiasm would be only too glad to recognize such loyalty.

It is unquestionably their own fault if men of wise discernment do not find halcyon days even in the Halycon church. Yours truly,

THE VICAR OF BRAY.

THE FIELD.

A LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

Dear Mr. Holmes:

. . . The outlook here is as black as midnight. When I think that Lloyd George was colleague of Campbell-Bannerman at the time this sublimely sane Democrat revealed to the world the healing power of magnanimous faith in his kind, by restoring "local autonomy to the Boers," and that the Welshman thus had first hand opportunity to study how generosity dissipated hatreds and generated abiding peace—well, I cannot forgive him for selling his soul to the English Tories, and with the selling of his soul becoming the scullery-maid of the French Tiger—who, in the blind intoxication of revenge is reducing the world to a pig-sty and life to a dog-fight.

But we are paying for bedlamite government—oh yes. Trade is paralyzed on a scale never previously known since England was England. Mills and factories, foundries and machine shops, mines and shipyards are closing down because the order books are not only empty but because the outlook is barren of the slightest promise of recovery.

We are at peace, but we still have war. Budgets inflicted upon us because we haven't sense enough to realize that war-governments are the wrong instruments to grapple with and demobilize war-bureaucracies. And Ireland! My God how I wish I could forget I was an Englishman when I think of Ireland! And how I blush to call myself a Protestant when I go over to Ireland—I have had a brother there these past twenty-three years—and witness for myself the curse of Popery. Not the Popery of Rome, however! My brother has lived twenty-three years in Dublin and during the whole of this time has never been questioned by Catholics respecting his religion or his politics. But as soon as a man goes into Ulster—especially on business—the questions, Are you a Catholic and a Home Ruler are asked. The curse of Ireland is Scotch Presbyterian and Methodist Popery. They have lived on hatred of Rome until they have been smitten with the disease itself and they make the fortunes and the destroying of that fair land the pawn of sectarian lust.

I think it is what I have seen in Ireland which more than anything else fills me with gratitude for your own anti-sectarian crusade. True religion unites men, it never divides them. And the world needs true religion today. Barren of statesmanship, blind leaders leading the blind, the churches fearing to say yea and not daring to say nay—individuals, communities and nations seem to be the sport of devils and hell apparently has let loose all its devils to participate in the carnival.

Yours ever,

TOWARD FUTURE PEACE.

More than two years have now elapsed since the Central Powers sued for peace, and actual fighting between them and the Entente ceased. Even yet, however, the world is not at peace; nowhere have normal conditions of life been restored, while over lands inhabited by hundreds of millions of people it has not been possible even to begin the work of restoration. To us as to many thousands more this is a profound disappointment, not only because such a state of things is deplorable in itself, but because of the high hopes that might reasonably have been entertained in November, 1918.

The Allies, it must be remembered, one and all accepted as a basis for the future peace the famous fourteen points of President Wilson. Whether, in any case, the Central Powers would then or later have been compelled to surrender at discretion, it is certain they had every right to expect a settlement substantially on the basis then laid down. And had the terms ultimately imposed at Versailles been conceived in the spirit to which this program committed the Entente, it is certain that immeasurably greater progress in the task of reconciliation and reconstruction would have been made ere now. The fourteen points not only represented the opinion of President Wilson, they put into definite shape ideas that had been forming in the minds of thinking people ever since the world began.

The Union of Democratic Control in this country and similar organizations abroad had familiarized the world with the ideas of (1) democratic control in foreign politics, (2) increased freedom of international trade, (3) reduction of armaments, (4) self-determination of peoples, and (5) a league of nations.

The Peace Treaty has been dictated by men who have proclaimed, but have not followed these ideals. It is a settlement, not arrived at by any "general association of nations" but dictated by the victors in the great war. It has not secured a diplomacy proceeding "frankly and in the public view," as the discreditable intrigues with the Russian adventures in arms against the Bolsheviks, and the secret agreement between France and Belgium show. It has not prevented the blockade of a great part of Europe in peace time. It has done nothing, therefore, to check the drift of Central Europe into famine and revolution.

The revision of the Versailles Treaty in the light of modern international thought, of the pre-armistice utterances of President Wilson culminating in the fourteen points and even in the earlier utterances of the Entente statesmen themselves, is imperative. This revision should be carried out by the representatives of all nations, irrespective of the parts they played during the great war, and should aim at:

1. The abrogation of all clauses in the treaty which demand ruinous and unworkable indemnities and other crippling economic conditions.
2. The immediate and general reduction of armaments.
3. The publication and registration of all existing treaties and understandings with a definite repudiation by each Power of any secret understandings to which it may at present be committed.
4. The honest application of the principle of self-determination with adequate safeguards for racial minorities.
5. The provision of adequate credits to countries ruined by the war, accompanied and conditioned by a wide extension of freedom of trade.
6. The immediate admission, on the same terms as those admitting the original framers of the League, of any nation desirous of joining the League of Nations.
7. An adequate supervision of the Mandates by the League in order to secure the liberty and well-being of the native races and an open door for trade.

The world has taken the wrong road and has manifestly lost its way; it can only recover it by retracing its steps to the signpost erected by those who had studied the path to peace. To preserve civilization, now manifestly threatened by destruction, it is necessary to go back to the policy identified with the fourteen points and to the widespread world ideal which it embodies.

We are, yours faithfully,

A. Aall (Professor of Philosophy at University of Christiania)
William A. Albright
Norman Angell
Lord Ashton of Hyde
Lady Barlow
Henri Barbusse
Sir Hugh Bell
H. N. Brailsford
Charles Roden Buxton
Noel Buxton
Lady Byles
Edward Carpenter
Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck
Lady Courtney
A. C. Drolsum (Chief Librarian University of Christiania)
Miss M. E. Durham
Very Rev. Moore Ede
Norman Garstin
Principal A. E. Garvie
Lady Dorothea Gibb
Y. Gleditsch (Dean of the Diocese of Christiania)
General Gough
(Mrs.) M. A. Hamilton
Knut Hamsun (Nobel prize-winner in literature for Norway)
Carl Heath
J. A. Hobson
Jerome K. Jerome
Rudolf Kycken (Professor at University of Uppsala)
R. C. Lambert
H. B. Lees Smith
Sir H. S. Leon
Lucien Le Foyer (Secretary General of Delegation Permanente des Societes Francaises de la Paix)
Jean Longuet (Editor of *Le Populaire*)
Earl Loreburn
J. Ramsay Macdonald
(Mme.) Madeleine Marx
Y. Meinich (Former Mayor of Christiania)
Lord Mersey
F. Merttens
S. Michelet (Professor of Theology at University of Christiania)
P. A. Molteno
Oscar Montelius (Ph. D., LL. D., Stockholm)
E. D. Morel
Dr. W. E. Orchard
Lord Parmoor
Sir George Paish
Arthur Ponsonby
Arnold Rowntree
(Miss) Evelyn Sharp
G. Bernard Shaw
F. J. Shaw
Robert Smillie
(Mrs.) Ethel Snowden
Philip Snowden
Ben Spoor, M. P.

(*Continued on page* 192)

opinion and dispositions who desire to work loyally for the cause itself should, by the free will of all, be represented.

An election is conducted by ballot unless it be otherwise determined.

* * * *

§ 11.

Discussions within the League and its sections should, as far as possible, be carried on with forbearance and good-will. In order to gain time, increase ability and improve results, a speaker should of his own will seek to concentrate himself and avoid unnecessary repetitions. In order to further promote such an arrangement, to allow new contributions to make themselves heard and to concentrate replies, everybody who has announced his intention to speak and who has not previously spoken, shall be called upon before a person who has previously spoken, and he who asks to speak for a second time shall have precedence over the person who is speaking for the third time and so on.

This paragraph should be read aloud at the beginning of every meeting when an extensive discussion may be expected. Compulsory measures to cut short the discussion may afterwards occur only in cases of necessity.

§ 12.

The editors of any newspaper or other publication founded by the League, or of any publication that may otherwise be associated with the League, shall seek to promote truth alone, never distort a matter or promote injustice for the sake of friendship, jealousy, ill-will or fear, and feel themselves required by their sense of responsibility to a just furtherance of the freedom of the press and of everyone's right to avail himself of it.

Under no pretext may editors make themselves masters over the paper or its columns and thereby seek to form an opinion in conflict with the ideas of the Manifesto.

Spiritual trusts arise in the same way, and follow the same laws, as economic trusts. Spiritual capitalism is a terrible reality, just as is economic capitalism, and must therefore be prevented.

§ 13.

It is assuredly most profitable for the movement that the work should to the utmost possible extent be performed voluntarily by the members themselves out of zeal for the cause itself. So far as salaried commissaries and functionaries are necessary, the decisive grounds of appointment should not be membership of a narrow circle of friends, the need of a livelihood, or any such consideration. What is especially required is real devotion to the fundamental ideas of the Humanistic Manifesto, combined with technical skill for the task in hand.

The commissaries and functionaries of the League are to treat the public with courtesy and civility.

The minutes and proceedings of the League and its sections will obviously be kept open to every member of the League, who also will have the right to make copies. The only exceptions are when a decision on the matter has been made for any certain case or when it is obvious that some particular matter cannot expediently be made public. Any difference of opinion upon this point is to be referred to the Peace Committee, and in the last resort to the National Congress.

§ 14.

Any alteration in the content of the Manifesto or this Fundamental Statute can be made by plebiscite or at a National Congress, but only after the Council of the League has expressed its opinion on the proposal. The Council of the League, however, may provisionally resolve upon minor additions to the Statute which prove technically necessary or have not been foreseen.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 221
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue